

changes in local rules are frequently mentioned. Bench-bar groups are also reviewing local rules on other matters and working together to develop more pro bono services for the public. There are also proposals that include partnerships between the court and legal services to provide legal information and assistance to self-represented litigants.

In addition, partnerships with local newspapers and television and radio stations are mentioned as techniques to get general information about the court and news of available services out to the community.

Conclusion

To date, the courts in 52 of California's 58 counties have participated in the action planning for self-represented litigants. These 52 counties contain 98 percent of California's population of approximately 34 million people. Forty-five of the counties have already provided action plans; 7 are still in the planning process.

While the development of public access legal information and education through the creation of self-help centers remained the centerpiece of most local action plans, 71 percent moved beyond this first step to proposals for system changes designed to facilitate management of self-represented litigant cases.

DIRECT SERVICES TO SELF-REPRESENTED LITIGANTS

Approximately 93 percent of these action plans are structured around staffed self-help centers under the supervision of attorneys. Support staff included paralegals, court clerks, law students and other community volunteers. Over 80 percent planned to expand the role of their family law facilitator to all aspects of family law and/or to other civil matters. In both litigant and judicial surveys where services were rated according to usefulness, staff available to answer questions ranked first in importance. Access to staff is frequently supported by the proposed use of telephone help lines, videoconferencing, fax and e-mail, and the use of self-help assistance vans.

Self-help-only types of technology such as written forms with instructions, interactive online forms programs, Web site information, kiosks, and telephone trees are frequently proposed. In some plans, these tools are used in outpost locations away from the court and are intended to be used by self-represented litigants without staff to answer questions. In others, technology is part of a more comprehensive plan in which these tools are used to augment and support the work of the self-represented litigants assistance staff.

SYSTEMS CHANGES

Reviews of local rules and forms, case management systems, and calendaring strategies were proposed. Some plans proposed the use of staff resources, particularly attorneys, in courtrooms to conduct settlement negotiations, answer procedural questions, and prepare written orders and judgments. Others proposed using attorney staff to review files prior to hearings and determine

their readiness to proceed. One plan proposed having staff conduct prehearing orientations for the public.

Plans included proposals for case management in which staff attorneys would conduct routine status conferences and settlement negotiations and assist litigants with completing the court process. Adjustments in calendaring, clustering of similar cases, staggering hearing times, and rational numbering of courtrooms were all proposed as well.

Facilities changes were also included, such as children's waiting rooms, other waiting areas for litigants, space in the courthouse for litigants to sit and work on their paperwork, the availability of copying machines and phones for litigants to use, extended hours of service, transportation to court, and easier parking.

COLLABORATION AND RESOURCES

Critical to all of the action plans were the partnerships formed with other government and community-based organizations. These partnerships were particularly useful in the planning stages. Some of the partnerships were also central to the implementation of action plans. For example, the participation of local bars with respect to unbundled legal services, pro bono representation, and volunteer services to pro se litigants was important to many plans. Collaboration with colleges, universities, and community centers for translation of materials into many languages was often reported. And working with libraries and other community agencies to create outpost assistance in more remote areas was also extremely important.

Collaboration also helped address the issue of funding, the main barrier to full implementation of all the local action plans. Finding the requisite resources to provide adequate staff for the projects is an ongoing challenge, particularly during the current budget crisis in California. Although one court suggested charging for self-represented litigant services on a sliding scale, most of the action plans reported their dependence on grant funding from various government sources.

In conclusion, the courts in California have gained a tremendous amount of information about the optimal direction for pro se matters from two important sources: the family law facilitator program and the community-focused strategic planning process. The family law facilitator program pioneered court-operated self-help on a mass scale in the state. The court-community focused strategic planning process initiated ongoing dialogue and collaboration between the courts and their communities. The current action planning process has brought these two efforts together to create plans that reflect a comprehensive view of the justice system as it relates to self-represented litigants.